BX
6945
.C67
1963

More Class Notes

More Class Notes

•

Arthur Corey

More Class Notes

Arthur Corey

THE FARALLON FOUNDATION
P. O. BOX 799
LOS GATOS, CALIFORNIA

Copyright 1962
Revision Copyright 1963
by
Arthur Corey

BX
6945
C67
1963

Printed in
The United States
of America

MORE CLASS NOTES

The Los Gatos - Saratoga class taught at my home, Casita Cresta, accommodated but a minor fraction of the applicants. Thus it seemed a happy fortuity when substantial notes taken of that analytical exploration of applied metaphysics were made available to me afterward. Their publication in 1956 not only provided review materials for those who came from various parts of the field for the event, but it enabled the absent students to share, at least in some measure, in the undertaking. Now, with this greatly enlarged edition of the original pamphlet it is possible to include additional material found useful by the many who attended the San Francisco class later on.

The present paper does not purport to be a comprehensive restatement of either course, nor can it be regarded as a rounded presentation of even the bare essentials. Nevertheless, however fragmentary it may be it does cover some of the cardinal points made, points which the students generally felt should be made a part of the permanent record for continuing study.

It is a commonplace that "class notes" are seldom very accurate. That does not mean they are worthless. On the contrary, every veteran Scientist can testify, as Bicknell Young pointed out to his pupils, that such notes can on occasion prove priceless. As

for the menace of inaccuracy, everybody knows the Bible contains many literary and historical inaccuracies, but no reputable Bible student has ever suggested that this invalidates the canonical writings as a whole.

A class in metaphysics, it should be needless to remind ourselves, is never a finishing course—even though it is clearly so considered by many class-taught students. Practically speaking, it can be but a step forward. A very big step it may be, big enough to prove a turning point in our lives—if we make it so. What it amounts to depends upon what we bring to it and what we do with that which we get out of it. In other words, it is always a matter of individual demonstration.

Class is literally a divine event—insofar as you, through demonstration, make it so. It is Truth appearing insofar as you grasp and prove it to be Truth. We are not foregathered here to contemplate absolute Truth formulated with finality, but simply absolute Truth as we see it at this juncture. In this relative sense or interpretation of things called human experience, every scientific discovery throughout history has turned out to be not a terminal step but a closer approximation to Truth.

The Newtonian concept of gravity was long regarded, with a most unscientific reverence, as an ultimate, only to yield after a while to Einstein's

relativity explanation, this in turn giving place to Max Planck's quantum view. Nevertheless it is to be observed that the advance of scientific thought does not discredit the former concepts wholly, since successful work was done within their framework in their day, and all the concepts remain linked through the ages as developments in the perception of underlying Truth.

A static concept of Truth, as Truth arrived at, is by its very nature stultifying, devitalizing, fatal. If there was a finality to Revelation that would finish everything. "Final Revelation" would be death. Conveniently forgotten by cultists, who must nurture a fixed image to worship, is the historic recurrence of "final revelations," every one of which has been supplanted by "a more enlightened view." Our loyalty, then, must fasten not upon sanctified formulations of the past, but upon the Truth which they aim to grasp, explain or express.

This is hardly a plea for fevered promiscuity. Metaphysical butterflies never seem to get straight on any school or level of thought. To be practical we must stay with the best exposition of Truth we know at the moment, treating it as though it were, indeed, ultimate, absolute Truth itself. Accordingly, what we are experiencing here together in this class must be regarded as essentially divine: divine Mind unfolding progressively as consciousness.

STUDY METHODS

Notetaking at lectures or in the study of a book ought to be a matter of one's study habits. Personally, I would feel frustrated if I could not take down what is said in the oral presentation of an important subject. Others find any writing distracts and would rather depend upon mental recall.

Parenthetically, the holding of this class is the result of unremitting requests from hundreds of students, and it is designed primarily to stress the practical application of Truth as we see it from this advantageous plateau.

Inquiries are numerous as to how best to study *Christian Science Class Instruction*, and I am reminded of an exchange between Bicknell Young and a hidebound pupil. Mr. Young said of the Kimball book, *Articles and Lectures on Christian Science*, that he recommended it heartily. "But aren't some students apt to lean too much on these books and upon notes?" he was asked. His answer was: "They lean upon *Science and Health* and that's a book!" "But," persisted the pupil, "we're not supposed to study these things as we would study *Science and Health*, are we?" With a note of impatience, Mr. Young asked, "How else would you study them?"

How you go about studying my treatise best is determined largely by your established study habits.

Incessant reading is not the panacea, I'm sure, much as the escapist students seem to believe. Still, in the absence of informed discussion or elucidation, no one has yet come up with a substitute for the printed word in pursuit of understanding and the dissemination of knowledge, spiritual or otherwise. In my widespread work for the movement I have seen the transformation of many a life through a persevering study of the book—which has the advantage over oral presentation in that you can go back and restudy it as often as need be.

Very much more could have been achieved throughout the development of our movement had our study materials been written with more scientific discipline of thought. The prevailing style in metaphysical writings has been the "inspirational"—which is the setting down by the author uncritically of whatever comes to him, rather than in an orderly arrangement of premises and step-by-step conclusions. A certain nebulousness naturally results from the haphazardness of such text—text in which the reader may skip around with as much benefit as if he read it straight through.

My treatise is not this type of exposition. It is written for study in the order given. As a rigorous analysis it falls automatically into systematic arrangement. Veteran students use a bookmark to work thoughtfully through it, usually many, many times,

they tell me. Where a passage strikes them as obscure or dubious, they go back as far as may be necessary into the preliminary foundation material to see how the conclusion in question was arrived at. Piecemeal study is not recommended as it is bound to distort perspective.

It is generally recognized among scholars that you have to stay with a serious treatise closely until you can honestly say you have mastered it. If you have mastered it, proof is in production of a better presentation. While my book does not purport to be anything in the way of a finalizing formulation, it is a rounded statement of the essentials as understood in highly responsible quarters at Boston and out in the field.

Unlike metaphysical writings generally, mine endeavor to be *explanatory* rather than simply *declaratory*. Declarations undeniably have their place, and can give the reader a lift, a serenity, a confidence; but it has always seemed evident to me that the survival and vigor of authentic science can only come through reasoned analysis. In the face of a plethora of mystical dogmatizing, the oft-voiced demand for an explanatory study was a decisive factor in my undertaking to publish such a work. Having said as much, I should say also that my private library, containing about everything ever printed in this field as well as priceless manuscripts

as yet unpublished, fully supports the above findings. (The collection is to be made accessible to all *bona fide* students visiting the Bridwell Library, Perkins School of Theology, Southern Methodist University at Dallas, Texas, to which institution I am donating it for preservation, protection, and perpetuation.)

Practical writers on metaphysics are invariably pestered to "write just straight metaphysics," sedulously avoiding any mention of such disconcerting subjects as historical facts which might conflict with sacred traditions; anything which might make the settled religious convert uneasy. Essentially, what such critics demand is a deluge of optimistic affirmations producing a tranquilizing, if not intoxicating, atmosphere of sweetness and light. It is true that the "Unity" branch of the great spiritual healing movement has won widespread popularity following such a course; but this is not the way of Christian Science, in which system the obtrusive inharmonies of human experience are taken up specifically for correction, resolution.

According to our school of thought, problems cannot be disregarded, but must be candidly faced, to be met through metaphysical treatment. Mrs. Eddy branded as unteachable those students who, to live in a fool's paradise, seek to teach mathematics without naming a cipher, covering up evil to

smoulder and break out into devouring flame. "The Three Monkeys"—See-No-Evil, Hear-No-Evil, Speak-No-Evil—she denounced as symbolizing not Christian Science, but heathen philosophy. The fatuous assertion that "all is well," when obviously all is not well, is not healing, but dangerously deceiving. "Alas for the future of Mind-healing," she wrote, "if built upon the sand of falsehood"! (*Journal*, Vol. V, p. 117)

So, instead of resting our precious faith on the specious premise that ours is a terminal discovery, let us free thought from this stultifying notion, that it may soar in the fetterless reaches of bona fide Science.

All but the ignorant or deceived know that our metaphysical system is but the contemporary phase of the age-old spiritual healing movement which has waxed and waned unceasingly from the very dawn of civilization. Of course the form in which it appears in any given era is determined by the language and concepts of the period and locale of its resurgence. From darkest Egypt onward, the fundamental interpretation of physical healing through mental endeavor — incantation, prayer, "treatment" — has progressed from the rankest of theological superstition to the level of a scientific discipline, necessarily in keeping with the fashion of the community and day.

Attributed to the capricious intervention of the gods in primitive Egyptian, Persian and Babylonian cultures, the healing phenomena were to be accounted for in the later Dark Ages on a casting-out-of-demons theory, references to which are abundant in the New Testament, giving rise to the continuing Roman Catholic dogma which was reiterated as late as 1958 by the Church of England (Episcopal) at London, in which healings are attributed to exorcism.

Around the fourteenth century there developed the rationale of the "sympathetic magnetic system," which became the craze of all Europe and gave currency to the term "animal magnetism," popularized by such leaders as Van Helmont and Paracelsus more than a century before Franz Anton Mesmer's version startled the world with sensational exhibitions at Vienna and Paris. Meanwhile, Emanuel Swedenborg was seeking to recapture spiritual healing for the theologians as a science of the Bible.

Mrs. Eddy's advent cannot possibly be understood without some knowledge of the milieu in which her Christian Science was incubated. She launched her bark in a Christian community at a time when Science was enjoying an extraordinary popularity among the masses, its glittering promises promoted by such powerful writers and lecturers as Darwin, Aggasiz, et al. Abundant proof that the merging of

Religion and Science was on every tongue is to be found in the enormous editions of such books as *The Elements of Christian Science*, brought out by William Adams a quarter of a century before the publication of *Science and Health*, as well as in the influential works of the transcendentalists Emerson, Alcott, and others, distilling the philosophic values of the past—orthodox Christianity, Greek idealism, the ancient Oriental doctrine of matter's unreality in "Maya", with overtones of Swedenborg and his "Glossary" of material-versus-spiritual definitions of scriptural vocabulary.

Unsophisticated students, jarred off base by these generally forgotten historical facts, not infrequently campaign for a new name to take the place of "Christian Science," feeling somehow betrayed by the traditionalists who would tamper with history in order to preserve their dogma of a proprietary revelation. But isn't this splitting hairs? After all, these reformist students continue to follow what has been universally established as the Christian Science line of thought.

At various stages in our spiritual growth we each of us find enthusiastic kinship with some particular teacher's exposition of the subject, minor cults sometimes developing out of this sort of thing. When first encountering the bold and brilliant Edward Kimball, foremost Eddy disciple, we tend to get

the feeling of having "arrived". After a while, those who have not become fixated at that point move on up the scale with the less-dualistic formulation of Kimball's successor, Bicknell Young. Still again, these many years later, we are obliged to mount higher with the far more monistic insight of contemporary thought, as focused in my treatise *Christian Science Class Instruction.*

That we still remain united on the fundamental thesis that God, Mind, is demonstrably All-in-all as good, identifies us inescapably as Christian Scientists, however much we may differ with our revered predecessors, even with our colleagues, on some of the resultant conclusions and applications.

THE MONISTIC APPROACH

To establish divine Mind as truly All-in-all is to "exchange the objects of sense for the ideas of Soul," as Mrs. Eddy described the redemptive process. This cannot mean that you do away with material things, but only with the material sense of things. Matter is not a something to be destroyed, but a misinterpretation to be corrected. And how can this be done? Why, through understanding reality for what it is regardless of what it appears to be. To *exchange* is to *understand* in this context. The result is transformation rather than annihilation. How else are you going to "break down the middle wall of

partition" and find that "in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God"? How else can you expect to raise the dead?

Not that the monistic approach represents an innovation. Monism was inherent in much that Plato saw and said, in line with which Kant could declare that "the reality is not something different from the object of sense, for the object of sense is the reality, seen under certain modes of perception." (*Selections From Plato*, T. W. Rolleston, p. xiii.) The trouble has been that our respected predecessors have not followed through on their glimpses, all the way through to attainment of and stabilization at the monistic level. They have touched upon monism sporadically. Perhaps they felt their public was not ready for it. Perhaps they could not see how it could be applied practically. Among Christian Scientists it has been repeatedly cited, only to be lost in a reversion to cherished precepts of the past. It is mighty easy to roll back comfortably into the popular groove of old-fashioned dualism.

Bicknell Young and many other authorities have pointed out that Mrs. Eddy's teachings are from various levels, and that this undeniable fact must be taken into account if her basic doctrine is to be understood. Otherwise it appears to be a mass of contradictions.

Relating the underlying absolutes to human values involves literary, psychological and philosophical difficulties which many students are unprepared to surmount. Suffice it to say that at her monistic peaks, Mrs. Eddy quite left behind her the Quimby-initiated system of affirmation-and-denial (the manipulation of human experience through mental argument), in favor of identifying with spiritual reality (which makes healing a matter of spontaneous reinterpretation instead).

An over-all study of Mary Baker Eddy's oft-revised writings shows unmistakably that she was moving on toward pure monism more and more as her doctrine developed and progressed throughout her later years.

It seems absurd to have to mention it, but I must call attention to the fact that none of this is meant invidiously. Cultist propaganda, to which we have all been long exposed, would in effect deify Mrs. Eddy as personally omniscient, infallible, so that any historical reference to contrary facts is made to look like an attack upon a revered leader. But was she not necessarily one like Jesus, tempted in all things as are we? How can you evaluate her pearls of great price without taking into account the modifying human factor? She herself implied as much. "Follow your Leader only so far as she follows Christ," was her admonition. In other words, "Fol-

low Christ." Period. This requires thoughtful discrimination, not blind acceptance of trivia as of equal value with profundities.

In passing, it is well to consider that we *demonstrate* infallibility only in a degree. Always just in a measure. Do not look for infallibility in people, but in Principle. Even Jesus is not credited with personal infallibility, notwithstanding the irresponsible claims of the idolators. The scriptures assert that "he did not many mighty works in his own country," even as you and I. He failed to heal the blind man at once, having to give a second treatment before the man could see men as more than trees walking. Jesus doubtless gave his most prayerful efforts to the regeneration of sinner Judas, yet we are told that he failed to heal the traitor, or even to escape himself the agonizing consequence of the Judas betrayal. (Orthodox theology might try to show a necessity for crucifixion in its doctrinal scheme—as was done before the Christian era in the sacred stories of Osiris and Mithra and Krishna and others—but this is no more than a transparent attempt to justify an unpallatable dogma. If we are going to accept the doctrine that pain and death are indispensable to mankind's redemption, either directly or vicariously, it would be blasphemy to seek escape from these evils, to heal the sick, to raise the dead, would it not?)

That Mrs. Eddy at times pointed up the monistic goal and deplored the timeworn dualism of popular theology, weighted down as she was by the prevailing orthodoxy of her day, testifies to her remarkable spiritual genius. That she did not forge through on this, and plant herself unyieldingly at the monistic level of thought and practice, is hardly discreditable or even surprising. Certainly she made it plain she did not expect her followers to remain stuck at the lower levels of her multilevel teachings. Indeed, she prophesied her followers' emergence from human relativity to absolute divinity, this in many passages. Who is to say that the time has not yet come for us to throw off the swaddling clothes? Bicknell Young said: "Do you expect to go on forever with the *relative* statements in *Science and Health*?"

A glance at the record will clarify this considerably.

In 1885 Mrs. Eddy declared (*Journal* Vol. 3, p. 133 *Misc.* 60-61) that every idea of Spirit is counterfeited in some matter belief, so that every material belief is the type and representative of a spiritual verity. This was two years before the celebrated Edward Kimball took up Christian Science, but it was eventually to provide him with his famous theme: "Behind every material object is a divine idea."

Here was a concrete proposition of decidedly practical value. But we cannot afford to linger

indefinitely at this unmistakably dualistic level. Mrs. Eddy left it far behind in some of the things she wrote later. Kimball took a giant step forward when he reduced it to the observation that "anything wrong in human experience would have to be a wrong sense of a right something." Although this was not pure monism, it looked in that direction and provided a stepping stone for his successors. Bicknell Young went very much further when he came out flatfooted with the assertion that what we call the material universe is the divine creation, dimly seen and incorrectly interpreted. That he did not pursue this principle consistently throughout all his teachings does not excuse us for dillydallying on that threshold indefinitely.

When I wrote *Christian Science Class Instruction* I sought to do nothing more than explore the subject as it is today understood in the more literate circles of the movement—as exemplified in some of the provocative statements of Edna Kimball Wait, Peter V. Ross, Margaret Ledward Laird, et al, and implied in Bicknell Young's penetrating remark that it is the mountain which we see through the mist, no matter how dimly and distorted, still the mountain itself. My book was not intended to be revolutionary, beyond breaking the well-known conspiracy of silence to bring "the truth that shall make men free" out into the wholesome light of day for all to

examine. Yet my book was no sooner out in 1945 than hundreds wrote me it was "a revelation"—an opinion I dismissed as but an expression of intemperate enthusiasm. Then the eminent Professor Braden's definitive study *Christian Science Today* forced recognition in 1958 that my book had, inadvertently, precipitated for the first time in print a truly vital issue in its intrinsic theme of monism. I say inadvertently, for I did not deliberately weave in this theme. It was simply that a strict hewing to analytical exposition brought the essential monism into sharp focus automatically. Reviewing my book, I was gratified to note that every chapter, even the ones on error, mortal mind, animal magnetism, evil, wound up with a lift, resolving everything back into Mind, giving God the glory. Perhaps another could have done as well or better with the job, but it hasn't been tried by anyone else before or since—an odd fact which might possibly be explained by the deep-rooted ecclesiastical inhibitions seen always in the organized ranks or by the fear of retaliation from religious monopolists heading organization.

Anyway, here we are at the inescapable recognition that the monistic approach is incumbent upon us, and with the happy realization that, though we are hardly at the end of the line, this means a vast measure of emancipation.

What a contrast is our "daily work" to that of our

spiritual forebears! The monist rises in the morning with anticipation of good, whereas it used to be that the conscientious Christian Scientist awoke to do battle with "the enemy"! A sunrise session in one's own mental closet has been customary among Christians and other religionists for eons. Called in recent times "the morning watch" and by the Oxford Groupers "the quiet time," it was a potential wellspring of strength, inspiration, guidance. That it could degenerate into a wrestling bout with the powers of darkness is a striking commentary on dualism. The monistic approach is quite different.

When you arise in the morning, why not establish day in thought as God's day, Mind's unfoldment of all events in divine order and harmony? This before the events of the day involve you in them. The unfoldment of Mind is the disclosure of good, taking you ever closer to immortality, evermore into the fullness of life and living, into the shimmering consciousness, without beginning or end, of God's plan and purpose realized. Today, *this* day, is God's day! It is perfection revealed. Beloved, *now* are we the sons of God. And it *doth* appear what we shall be, for we do see Him as He really is. And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself, even as he *is* pure.

That's the monistic approach.

The following citations from *Christian Science*

Class Instruction focus the issue sharply:

28:5-8	174:1-12
94:25-28	194:13-14
97:1 to 108:20	196:8-13
150:14 to 151:2	200:14-16
154:7 to 155:26	203:7-8 and 23-24

PRACTICALITY

It is wonderful to have our heads in the clouds but let us keep our feet down to earth. Let us not be dreamers, but doers of the Word. The ubiquitous tendency to shy away from the demands upon us by taking refuge in an insular realm of fantasy has plagued the movement from the start. With serene smile, escapists resort to *statements* in place of demonstration, giving a stone for bread in the glib cliches and facile sophistries with which we are all-too-familiar. One is not dwelling in the absolute because he talks in the absolute. Practicality is our keynote, and I know of nothing more important to be said at this juncture than this:

You are obliged to start out from right where you are at the moment. How you got here, in belief or otherwise, is entirely irrelevant. The fact is: here you are. You are not going to be able to disregard things as they seem to be, including yourself as you appear to be currently. If we waited to become saints, there'd be no practitioners!

It goes without saying that all of us here are trying to reach and hold onto absolute Truth, and there is nothing at all to keep us from adhering to what we see of Truth. This we do within, all the while taking such steps on "the outside" as seem to be required of us. As we do this, we find human experience, circumstances, situations, altering ever for the better, this with spontaneity and without labored mental work, more and more forevermore.

How we go about achieving the spiritual realization that is transforming has properly been one of the chief concerns of the earnest metaphysician.

TREATMENT

Let it be confessed that we who are teachers have not always felt free to come right out with our own procedures. In the first place, our methods alter as understanding advances, so that we are embarrassed when our outgrown statements are thrown back at us. Worse than this, we know all too well how silly we can be made to look by being quoted out of context or in inappropriate context. Still worse, forthright teachers quickly learn that others, who see treatment differently, with righteous zeal embroil the nonconformist in ruinous controversy. Thus precious few dare to say, "this is how I give a treatment . . ." This situation is nothing new. The pioneer Frances Thurber Seal said that after

going through the class of Eddy apostle Laura Lathrop she hadn't the foggiest notion of how to give a treatment. Many write me the same thing, in substance, about contemporary classes and teachers.

You cannot afford to allow such considerations to immobilize you or to compromise your principles. You just have to do the best you can as you go along, letting the chips fall where they may and trusting in demonstration to save you.

To be practical you simply have to start out from where you are with what you seem to be and with what you have, with things as they appear to you at this or any other instant. However much the form and content of your "treatments" may change eventually, you have to proceed with something concrete.

Those of you who have not had personal instruction from seasoned metaphysicians might not know that treatment, traditionally, is a silently or audibly spoken argument in favor of the patient's inherent perfection. Mrs. Eddy described such a treatment in an 1889 *Journal* (Vol. 6, p. 249), revising this for her *Miscellaneous Writings* (p. 220) in 1898. This is an example of what is known in the profession as "addressing the thought," and it remains the hallowed pattern of perhaps the majority of Journal-listed practitioners. The unseemly scramble in the

field for various teachers' class notes has been primarily a search for more and better arguments for meeting various ailments.

The archaic notion that treatments should be little mental arguments applied like mustard plasters to particular areas of human experience and aimed specifically toward some finite effect, has been pretty much superseded with the advance of understanding in recent decades. Admittedly the temptation still is to fasten upon some pat cliche or trick formula which seems to precisely fit the fever, the cancer, the quarrel, the fracture, the overdrawn bank account, the marital impasse. The futility of the tailored treatment is exposed by the conflicting, and sometimes grossly mistaken, analyses and diagnoses one finds in the class teachings and hears at testimony meetings. The mystical-minded, however, perpetuate the dogma that divine Mind will unmask the offending error specifically. What does divine Mind know about so-called mortal-mind belief? Healing comes from the lifting of thought to the redemptive level of Spirit, the identification of consciousness with and as infinite Mind. With this less restricted sense of treatment, healings become more spontaneous, more frequent, more far-reaching.

In the welter of papers and notes traded about behind the scenes appear some strange incantations, not a few of which achieve considerable vogue.

Judge Smith's wife was unable to overcome a bursting headache until, on a sudden inspiration, she declared: "Why, everything Mrs. Eddy ever wrote is true!" Not a few latched onto this as a sure-fire specific. Again, in a *Sentinel* article which enjoyed great popularity, a woman told of suffering from chronic fainting spells until, one red-letter day, she resisted the temptation to lean against a nearby post when she felt a seizure coming on, saying: "I must lean on divine Principle only!" Another's sick dog failed to respond to treatment until the Practitioner overheard its owner call it "Boy" and knew (?) in a flash that the whole trouble was simply mistaken identity! Nor can I plead innocence. When an irascible patient showed up with an inflamed skin, I handled her irritability! Inside the movement these things are not told as humorous anecdotes, but as serious examples of effective treatment!

Before we dismiss the whole works as a sad farce, let us consider the fact that the prominent practitioners cited above have many healings to their credit. Even I redeemed myself somewhat when the patient mentioned recovered instantly, on another occasion while under my treatment, of a nasal growth which she, a medical nurse, diagnosed as cancer. (Her testimony of this healing is to be found in the *Sentinel* of February 1, 1940, Vol. 43, p. 436, on my copy of which she has identified her

practitioner). Those of us who have worked our way out of that phase recognize that it was not the formula which did the trick but some other element. Somehow in spite of the fallacious declarations we must have attained a spiritual altitude bringing redemption.

Other questions come up which, while amusing to some, are serious to others. People ask if you close your eyes while giving a treatment. That question is not as foolish as it may sound, for religionists have been given to closing their eyes during prayer. The orthodoxies are not the only ones. Everyone has seen Christian Scientists and New Thoughters in the characteristic pose: eyes closed and head bowed with thumb and index finger at nosebridge in what has irreverently been dubbed "the practitioner's pinch." Now, seriously, if it helps you to close your eyes while treating, why not close them? Or if you think you think better with your eyes wide open, why not open them? I'll never forget how startled I was on one occasion when, as First Reader, I glanced out from the platform inadvertently during silent prayer to catch several practitioners in the congregation eyeing me candidly! When I had collected myself I realized they could pray as well open as shut.

If you can't conceive of metaphysical work without the employment of audible arguments, just shout

away. You only erect unnecessary roadblocks, phantom problems, when you allow yourself to be diverted or immobilized by self-condemnation or by morbid preoccupation with the transient mechanics of your reach for realization.

If to you the use of a venerated formula is indispensable, what else can you do but resort to it? For years my handling of all difficulties consisted in the silent recitation of "the scientific statement of being" (*Science and Health*, p. 468), and one of my students was to write a whole book in which this most popular passage would be paraphrased in various forms to meet various kinds of cases. Martha Harris Bogue, the Detroit teacher, used to rely in a similar way on adaptations of Mrs. Eddy's poem *Christmas Morn*. Mrs. Bogue was satisfied that this accounted for some outstanding recoveries in her practice. Whether it did or not, it was her way of working. Presumably we'll all outgrow such notions eventually. If experience is any criterion, you will find with me that, as time goes on, you will fall back less and less on routines and rituals, conceding them ever less importance and meaning.

The more you know about the whole business the simpler it becomes. As you grasp Divinity's omnipresence, you recognize that going about denouncing matter is worse than a waste of time; it is pernicious. In everyday practice you may find your-

self utilizing detailed analysis, and if you can't rise to a higher level I don't know why you shouldn't go ahead on this one with a clear conscience. As you cultivate the divine idea through application, though, I am confident you will find that details are increasingly dispensed with. If practitioners agree on any one feature of treatment, it would surely be that your goal is not the exploration of materiality, error; it is spiritual realization, the fullest experiencing of Divinity, of God as infinite all-constituting Mind. Whatever the argument or analysis, its purpose is to clear consciousness that the truth of being may unfold freely.

I dare say there will be times when every one of us will find it expedient to reduce our thinking to words—*silent* words, of course, for metaphysics is mental, not physical. You might find yourself having to fall back on some such line of thought as this: "This thinking that I call treatment is the enforcement of divine law; it is Mind unfolding, whether interpreted as my private thinking or that of the patient; creation, or Mind unfolding, may seem for the moment to be material and spread out in space around me, but it is all mental and right here within the realm of consciousness or I wouldn't, couldn't, be aware of it; so here I *can* realize the presence of God as the only presence, indeed as all there is to the so-called patient or to anything else; I am myself this realization here and now."

Such handling is obviously subjective (within), while its results must appear objectively (as being without). You would lose your bearings and invalidate your work if you tried to isolate yourself from your world, whatever that world may look like for the nonce. "Demonstration" is but a better sense or interpretation of being. Healing is revealing. The process is the process of reinterpretation, a reinterpretation which takes place spontaneously, inexorably, in the ratio that your understanding advances.

We have observed that the treatment work is designed to clear the human element out of the way that God may appear. Argument and analysis may be for the purpose of clearing consciousness, but *whose* consciousness? The practitioner's? The patient's?

We have come up to a radically new level in the teachings with the precipitation of this question, and are forced to recognize at this level that Mrs. Eddy here abandoned the pioneer concept of "addressing the thought" which so long dominated the movement.

OMNIPRESENCE VERSUS TELEPATHY

What is the connection between the practitioner and the patient? How does the healer reach the sufferer?

Oldstyle treatment was predicated upon the practitioner addressing the thought of the patient, audibly or silently or both, with the object of changing the patient's consciousness of disease and suffering to one of ease and loss of suffering. (Misc. 219) This clearly entails entry into the patient's private sphere of thought, as is made irrefutably plain in Mrs. Eddy's 1881 *Private Directions for Metaphysical Healing*, and nine years later in her *Journal* article preserved for posterity by her in *Miscellaneous Writings* (p. 220).

What is not so plain is *how* the practitioner's argument reaches into the patient's consciousness when he is not spoken aloud to or is off at a distance. Mrs. Eddy says the sick who are absent from their healers can be healed through Science as readily as those who are present, but she omits saying how this is possible. The assertion that "space is no obstacle to Mind" is not, of course, explanation. Does she anywhere give such an explanation? Yes.

In an extraordinarily revealing article in the *Journal* (Vol. 6, p. 559), Mrs. Eddy explains the communication between patient and practitioner as telepathic, speaking of "a mind taught its power to touch other minds *by the transference of thought*, for the ends of restoration from sickness, or, grandest of all, the reformation and almost transformation into the living image and likeness of God." By

thought transference, then, the patient's offending beliefs were to be argued down within his consciousness, whether the practitioner is present on the immediate scene or absent from view, and probing the patient's consciousness via mind-reading is advocated in many passages to facilitate this procedure.

This fundamental thesis was left behind, cancelled out, as Mrs. Eddy revealed higher levels of understanding. What becomes of "the transmission of thought" between people when it is declared the Christian Scientist is forever "alone with his own being," so that "if the *healer realizes* the truth, it will free his patient?" The writer of these challenging lines says the Savior—not the patient but the practitioner—saw the perfect man, and this correct view (on the part of the practitioner) healed the sick. (*Science and Health*, 476:32 - 477:4)

Accordingly, Kimball taught that when the practitioner has what he calls a patient, with everything mental, what he is confronted with is strictly a mental image, that the only thing to do is to meet its erroneous aspects mentally, that when he clears his own mentality he knows he will have nothing else to do and that he never can do anything else, that he has nothing to do with matter or, so far as that goes, with his patient (as an external entity).

Here is an absolutely revolutionary departure from the old order, and perhaps the most striking

illustration in all Mrs. Eddy's writings of distinct levels of understanding, outlook, method.

Thus we discover that the puzzle over reaching the patient mentally is, after all, an artificial issue, another phantom problem. We do not have a mind that spreads out into space in every direction, to encompass the universe and pack its interstices; what we have is infinite Mind right here, all-embracing, all-constituting, nondimentional consciousness.

In the healing work we are never dealing with people *per se*, but with a limiting sense or interpretation to be transformed by the outlook of Spirit. All you need know about your patient is that, properly understood, he is Mind manifest. This manifestation is found to have the character of God, which is perfection. Today's metaphysician, alone with his own being or consciousness, recognizes that he is obliged to handle everything at the threshold of awareness, rather than trying to reach "out there," mentally or otherwise.

The following citations may be helpful for study:

Christian Science Class Instruction, 175:4-15

Personal Introduction to God, 151:30 to 152:14

Christian Science Today, 316:12 to 317:11, 341:6 to 343:2 and 346:31 to 352:29

ANIMAL MAGNETISM

Traditionally a Christian Science class opens with

a dissertation on Divinity, followed by an exhaustive examination of its suppositional opposite "mortal mind," then winds up with discussion of the healing process and the methods of operation. In the 1937 Normal class at Boston, Bicknell Young told the prospective instructors to "teach God two and a half days" in their Primary classes, then launch into a somewhat briefer consideration of spiritual man and universe. It is customary for the modern Dante, after leading them up onto the mountain top, to conduct his charges down into the inferno of "mortal mind," poking around in the deliciously frightening claims of mind reading, mental contagion, deadly thought projection, and the like. It is only after this fearsome excursion into the nether world that the physical healing and spiritual regeneration are taken up.

Now it is true that the black magic phase of the course is the most dramatic and entertaining–and for many the most memorable—feature. But it is also true that its sensationalism tends to eclipse the basic idea that good is demonstrably all. Veteran class-taught students not infrequently speak of the spiritualizing lift they enjoyed in the opening sessions, only to add ruefully that they lost the exalting Vision in the succeeding preoccupation with the horrors—albeit "suppositional" horrors—of this malicious-animal-magnetism precept.

Writing in 1923 of his intimate association with Mary Baker Eddy during the pioneer period of 1870, the unimpeachably loyal Putney Bancroft referred to this element of the teaching as "its most vulnerable feature," and pointed out that among students then, as now, malicious animal magnetism "was more to be feared than sickness, sin and death, and was capable of producing either or all of these unless it could be overcome by Christian Science." He observed that, despite their lip-service to the omnipresence and omnipotence of God, students generally "think of it as a reality while regarding sickness and death as belief only."

Of course the hidebound dogmatist, the impervious religious convert, would dismiss Bancroft as himself a deluded tool of malicious animal magnetism. To the uncommitted thinker, however, Bancroft's findings speak for themselves and in consonance with presentday observations. And if *you* find this disclosure disturbing, perhaps you'd better handle animal magnetism!

Well, if we can't get this devil out of the way, we cannot hope to establish an abiding sense of Divinity. Instead of building up a frightening monster, only to battle with it endlessly, it is incumbent upon us to dispense with M.A.M., so called in the trade, as literally nothing.

From ancient times orthodox theology has found Satan an indispensable doctrinal device for excusing the shortcomings and failures of its saints and deities, and in setting itself up as a rescue mission. Out of this has emerged "the Adversary," a something so much more powerful than the all-powerful Lord that it takes both God and man working together to defeat him!

But *we* are beyond this sort of thing. Or are we? We piously declare that "the starting point of divine Science is that God, Spirit, is All-in-all," then turn right around and admonish each other to put on our mental armor and gird for battle with this mortal mind, this "nothingness calling itself something," and acting for all the world, as Kimball put it, like a personal Devil!

Isn't this clearly a hang-over from our much-maligned Old Theology? Simply mentalizing Satan does not dispose of him. It keeps him around. How can we expect to advance scientifically while keeping one foot firmly planted in the exorcist morass of the Dark Ages? To harp on "mortal mind," to attribute our difficulties to its diabolical machinations, is to raise a phantom entity which can well prove our nemesis every step of the way.

When fog drifted into the auditorium and he became confused in his delivery of a Christian Science lecture in London, Bicknell Young halted

abruptly, then said to a startled audience: "Mrs. Eddy did not invent animal magnetism!" Indeed she did not. Even its most notorious exponent, Mesmer, was not its originator. A century before the advent of mesmerism, van Helmont had popularized the term *animal magnetism* while chief practitioner of the "sympathetic magnetic system," the craze of Europe and the current form of the great spiritual healing movement which has continued throughout all recorded history. The quasi-scientific emphasis of the movement was to shift to the theological with Emanuel Swedenborg, the mystic who displaced animal magnetism with Satan. In Mrs. Eddy's era, the Victorian, when the prevailing style of writing was characterized by melodrama and hyperbole, animal magnetism had again taken the spotlight as an explanation for widely diverse phenomena not then understood but since explained away on other grounds. Thus whatever her own convictions on the power and operation of "animal magnetism," it provided a figure of speech carrying the connotations she sought for stigmatizing evil. As a thing in itself, she declared it substanceless, powerless, unreal, and it would seem best for us to take her at her word on this score. Surely by now the conceit, if not the expression, has outgrown its usefulness.

You know, the contemporary form of the age-old spiritual healing movement was incubated in the Victorian atmosphere of ouija boards, itinerant mesmerists, awesome materialization seances in the dark, such public spectacles as that of young Lulu Hurst, "the Georgia magnet," who literally panicked audiences by dragging strong men wildly about the stage and forcing them to their knees with the touch of her delicate finger. No wonder our late mentors took occultism seriously, allowing it to become a modifying factor in their basic teaching! They could not then have suspected that ouija boards were later to be exposed as instruments of unconscious muscular action, that the "mesmeric fluid" would be recognized as a phantom of misinterpretation, that most spiritualistic mediums would be unmasked as humbugs, that little Lulu would eventually confess that her "animal magnetism" exhibitions were built upon the cunning manipulation of bodily balances and leverages.

Curiously, the black magic feature of the class teaching became entrenched and remains traditional. Frank Leonard regaled his pupils with the story of a wicked mesmerist who undertook to assassinate Mrs. Eddy through thought projection, in the voodoo manner, only to be foiled by Mrs. Eddy's unique spiritual power, which brought him cringing

to her feet. In a Kimball class Lord Dunmore was encouraged to elaborate fantastic tales of a fakir's feats in his own garden in India, where terrifying storms and earthquakes were conjured up and dispersed at will. Judge Smith said Gussie Stetson peered through solid brick walls to bring chills and fevers and death to her opponents. Herbert Eustace told about the shattering of an African chief's hip "by sympathetic mesmerism" when his alter ego, in the person of a crocodile in a distant swamp, was injured identically by hunters. Edna Kimball Wait insisted that certain antagonistic Theosophists spirited a document out of her home by occult means. Bicknell Young often described the poltergeist haunting of his Roslyn Place house, where the whole family was awakened during the night by ear-splitting reverberations which sounded like the ripping up of the downstairs flooring, the phenomenon ceasing instantly when audibly denounced as hypnotism. (The noise which assaulted the Youngs doubtless came from the then-popular "ticktack," a notched spool spun against a windowpane by the spiteful prankster whom Mr. Young mistakenly credited with occult powers.)

The trouble with this sort of thing is that it makes occult operations an actuality in human experience in the same way that mechanical or physiological operations are actual, then injecting this assumption

into a purely metaphysical cosmology. This results in some absurdly mystical diagnoses and treatments. The late Lillian Everson wrote me about an organic heart ailment troubling her: "Don't try to tell me my suffering isn't from astrological influences, for I know from personal experience and observation!" Bicknell Young said that in any case involving "the claims of horoscopy," such data as might be needed by the practitioner on the positions of the stars under which the victim was born could be found in a little book called "the Ephemeris." Quite a few present-day teachers in the church cite the sensational Dunninger performances on television as proof of the human actuality and practicability of mindreading and clairvoyance, whereas Joseph Dunninger is a professional trickster.

[At this juncture, Mr. Corey performed the Dunninger *piece de resistance,* apparently reading the minds of several members of his audience to whom he had not previously spoken. Then he showed how this miraculous feat was accomplished at the merely mechanical level, by misdirection and manipulation. Unbeknownst to the audience as a whole, precisely as in the case of the television audience, a few of the early arrivals had been approached by a fellow student who told them Mr. Corey planned an experiment in connection with which they were asked to secretly concentrate on

some simple thought, then hold that thought throughout the opening of the coming session. Then, apparently as an afterthought, they were asked to jot down what they had in mind without disclosing it to anyone else, retaining the paper on which they had written it for later verification. Meanwhile, a concealed device had taken a tracing of their writing to be conveyed surreptitiously to the "mindreader" for his startling performance later. Not only were these subjects mystified, but the others of the hundred spectators were left without any possible clue to a mundane solution, knowing nothing about the essential preliminaries.]

Hereward Carrington, most famous of psychical researchers and a close friend of mine, testified to extraordinary experiences with spiritistic and other occult phenomena, all unexplainable on the usual charges of malobservation and fraud, but wrote me shortly before his passing that a lifetime in that field had failed to dispel his initial skepticism. Such indications as have been found that these phenomena are possibly genuine show that telepathic and kindred activities are spontaneous, sporadic, rare and uncontrollable. There is no published evidence that anyone has ever been able to send or receive specific thoughts at will, much less to murder people through mental action unimplemented physically.

Formerly classed as occult, hypnotism is now a

respectable branch of psychology. While hypnosis has been faked occasionally for theatrical purposes, it is a scientifically recognized phenomenon. An abnormal state artificially induced, it is employed in psychiatry and was, before the discovery of Choloroform, used to produce anaesthesia for major surgery.

How does it work? Suppose you were asked to walk a six-inch-wide plank ten feet long, laid out here on the floor of our classroom. You could do it easily. But could you walk this narrow plank if it were elevated ten stories up to bridge two buildings? It is not at all likely that you would be able to get across the yawning chasm it spanned. Why? You could argue yourself blue in the face that you had walked this same board with ease and confidence when it was down on the ground, but high up you would be dominated by the thought of falling. Here is an emotionally-charged idea that would prevail over all your reasoning and arguments, a suggestion that would control you irresistibly.

The experienced hypnotist understands this mental mechanism and knows how to plant ideas through suggestion so that your thought will be centered exclusively on them. Where the fixation, a narrowing of awareness to an abnormal concentration, is sufficiently extreme, the subject can lose sight of his surroundings. At least, in some way he shuts

them out to the extent that he appears even oblivious of pain.

Suggestions implanted during the hypnotic trance will be carried out by the subject after he has been awakened. Unable to recall the happenings of the trance, he will nevertheless succumb to an irresistible impulse to perform the suggested actions, which may be unreasonable and bizarre in character.

Hallucinations may be readily induced in deeply hypnotized subjects because the preoccupation with any suggested idea or picture is so complete as to exclude the objective observations which ordinarily offset fantasy. Thus a subject may be led to imagine himself retrogressing back to his own birth, even behind that into supposedly prior incarnations. Of course no evidence has been adduced that any such subject actually visited the earth previous to his present incarnation. There is no historical or other corroborative evidence that Bridey Murphy lived in bygone Ireland, or that the excursion of Morey Bernstein's subject into a previous incarnation was anything but hallucinatory. Autoscopy presents a similar phantom problem, wherein the individual experiences the belief that he is standing outside his body and looking back at it. Likewise, the feeling that one has been there before when visiting a new place, often cited in support of the theory of reincarnation, is a feeling, not a memory,

and is commonly known as *deja vu.*

Orthodox Christian Science teachers generally ascribe all mystifying phenomena and experiences to hypnotism, as a handy catch-all. The majority of them use as an example of "mass mesmerism" the Great Indian Rope Trick, in which it is claimed that a rope is thrown skyward by the fakir, to be climbed by a boy until he disappears aloft. In the first place, hypnotizing is strictly an individual operation, and there is no such thing as collective hallucination, where a hypnotist spellbinds a whole crowd to see the same illusory event. In the second place, the Rope Trick, as any professional magician will tell you, is nothing more than a myth, corresponding to our story of Jack and the Beanstalk and traceable all the way back to thirteenth century China.

The point is that we cannot afford to let mysteries determine the direction of our metaphysical conclusions. After all, such eerie phenomena as we have been discussing, whether genuine or spurious, are essentially irrelevant. Our basic premise that divine Mind is All-in-all leaves all questions of communication, materialization, and so on, strictly in the realm of human belief or interpretation. Fantasies are exploded and actualities are harmonized not by our becoming involved in them but by our thinking out from above them.

There may be some value in seeing how hypnotism works, since it gives us an insight into the nature of what we denominate human thinking. Is it not hypnotic that we are prisoners of our own concepts, finding it difficult to escape their confines even when we recognize them for what they are? What is "error," anyway, but fixation of thought on some limitation?

But let us know whereof we speak before we adopt as pillars for a scientific structure every appearance of the seemingly miraculous.

PHANTOM PROBLEMS

Many have been the false issues in the path. Some of them we have mentioned as "phantom problems," and this designation represents a radical insight well worth some serious thinking. Let's talk about it.

If you approach man from the physiologist's viewpoint, you can dissect and analyze him down to the very last cell and to its very last atom without finding anything but matter. No trace of mind is uncovered in the process. On the other hand, if vou approach man from the standpoint of the psychologist, you will encounter not an atom of matter in all this realm of consciousness. Now, then, the ancient fallacy of seeking to understand the relationship, the connection, the coordination between mind and matter, the mental and the physical, poses a dualism—a dualism which proves everywhere unresolvable. But if you will just think this thing

through without any preconceptions, you will recognize that the physiologist and the psychologist are each approaching the same single thing, but, because of the limitation inherent in their respective points of view, the result is *two* concepts of *one* thing. What has been regarded as correlation is found, then, to be but the oneness dimly seen and incorrectly interpreted. The metaphysicist, approaching man from the vantage of infinite Mind, finds nothing but Mind. The dualism of the "unreal" paralleling the "real" turns out to have been but a phantom problem.

Take another example. Physicists for more than a century have debated as to whether light is essentially wavelike in character or corpuscular. In some laboratory experiments light acts precisely like waves, the length and frequency of which may be measured accurately, while in other experiments light acts exactly as though it were composed of particles. That our current interpretation or sense of being includes such conflicting observations may signify nothing more than that we have advanced insufficiently in our scientific understanding of the underlying reality to see what it is which can be interpreted in different ways so as to appear to be more than one thing.

Philosophers who get lost in a stubborn search for the origin of evil are another example of victim-

ization by a phantom problem. You will find that people in our own field who hammer at this particular question are invariably those who have been innoculated by old-school mentors, as this was the popular issue among intellectuals during the incubation period of our movement. From our present level of somewhat more advanced understanding, the mystery of evil's origin and the need for a solution is strictly a phantom problem, no better than the puerile demand for an explanation of twice-two-is-five.

Why build up these irrelevant questions? Why not dwell with twice-two-is-four, where twice-two-is-five is unknown? Why not seek to dwell with Truth, of which error is no part nor implication? Practitioners who persist in dividing all the things of the universe into two categories, the real and the unreal, true and false, spiritual and material — nay, the authorized and the spurious!—belong to a passing generation. Dualism is self-defeating. You can't carry your patient through the Pearly Gates while bearing the incubus of "mortal mind" on your back. You can't realize the infinity of divine Mind while wandering in the mazes of malicious animal magnetism. Somewhere along the way we are going to have to shake off this suppositionalism as a cherished explanation, scapegoat, alibi. Clinging to archaic expressions or outmoded concepts will not prove

helpful in the task. Hesitancy to mount the Great White Throne and survey the glory of all creation therefrom belongs not to a redemptive system based upon the allness of good.

"THE HUMAN FOOTSTEPS"

A first principle of metaphysical practice is that one must never endeavor to act beyond his demonstrated ability. It is only the dualistic theorist who construes "radical reliance on Principle" as radical defiance of human necessity, and in effect attributes healings to the rejection of so-called material aids. He would rob the unhealed cripple of his crutches. How many misguided martyrs have lost their jobs through refusing to wear needed spectacles! Do you remember the woman who urged her blind daughter to walk alone through busy New York traffic and down the church balcony steps to the very brink, all in the belief that healing could not come unless they literally refused to recognize blindness? With what pride this dunce told her hair-raising story in the letter circulated so joyously through the ranks!

Traveling the monistic path, one never encounters such an issue. "The earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof." Knowing this, everything that is illegitimate about the picture falls away. The monist would regard crutches as an apprehension of Principle sustaining man, seen in the only way possible

at this level of understanding. Glasses would be but a facet of the interpretation of Mind seeing, indispensable until advancing understanding brings about a different and better interpretation.

Despite certain statements which seem to justify physical neglect, Mrs. Eddy made it inescapably clear, both by precept and example, that she expected her followers to always act within their proven powers of the moment. Radical reliance on Principle is something to be achieved within, not through practical disregard of human need. It is maintaining one's inner fidelity to Principle while doing outwardly what seems wise and necessary.

If you cannot determine this for yourself but must have an authority, listen to what else Mrs. Eddy counsels. She warns that until perfection is demonstrated, "the human footsteps" leading thereto are indispensable; that until one can prevent bad results he must avoid their occasion; that surgery *and* the adjustment of broken bones must be left to the knowledgeable and practiced fingers of a surgeon until we have proved our ability to set things aright without such assistance; that narcotics may be used for the relief of pain; that where Scientists fail to conquer so-called physical difficulties through strictly metaphysical procedures, they will be divinely led into the effective use of "temporary means," human expedients; that while Jesus may have walked upon

the water it would be foolhardy for us to step out upon the Atlantic; that being a practitioner involves "infinitely more than to know that mind governs the body and the method of mental practice." She does not forbid the employment of a doctor, but says that *if* you employ one, "great caution should be exercised in the choice of a physician." The bane of the movement has been the obdurate tendency to assume a position which one has not yet demonstrated. It would be the rankest of superstition to gamble human life on mere dogma—and that is what one would be doing if he persuaded himself or his patient to forego human help on the strength of a blindly held tenet of faith. As Mrs. Eddy pointed out, Truth is *not* understood *until* demonstrated.

This is common sense. But some of us have had our judgment dulled by the incessant hammering at ecclesiastical decrees, supported by adroit propaganda. It is a matter of public record that the Boston authorities deal summarily with practitioners and teachers who do not stand militantly against "materia medica" under any and all circumstances. In their letter excluding the famous Margaret Laird from the *Journal* registry, the Mother Church directors said they were acting, in part, on the allegation that Mrs. Laird had countenanced medical help for patients while under her metaphysical care.

Brushed aside was her defense contention that she had innumerable healings to her credit, including the Hedrick cancer healing, and made concessions only for humanitarian reasons, as Mrs. Eddy admonished.

It would not be a brave, but a naive and reckless soul indeed who would try to stay in the church organization while dealing candidly with sufferers known to require physical help, so called, when working mentally toward spiritual dominion. The long, sorry record continues as a warning that the independent humanitarian will be crucified if he stays within the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical authority while disregarding its rulings.

How dare you compromise your integrity—not to mention risking the lives and well-being of patients —on the specious premise that you can do more for Christian Science by surrendering to religious dictatorship instead of acting boldly in accord with reason and conscience and demonstration? If you get into trouble, don't suppose you can go running back to the ivory tower instigators of this perilous policy; officialdom does not take kindly to those who bring down notoriety on the organization, whatever the situation.

If you feel you do not have to abide by hygienic requirements, quarantine in cases of contagious disease, recourse to known specifics in critical conditions, you may be sure that you are still subject to

civil law. Membership in the Church does not confer legal immunity upon you, nor will you be excused by keeping your mental fingers crossed. Under the law you are responsible for the proper care of people entrusted to your hands. The overworked argument that anything goes because the Constitution guarantees the free exercise of religion has been repudiated time and again by the higher courts. Were the Mormons permitted to go on practicing polygamy in accordance with their religious tenets? More to the point, judicial and jury decisions have increasingly been against religionists who decline medical and surgical help to the detriment of themselves, their dupes, their community. The legal principle involved is simply that individual liberty, religious or otherwise, cannot be extended to where it interferes with the liberty and welfare of others—especially of the immature and helpless.

There have been many disasters in the movement through physical neglect—in other words, from acting beyond demonstration—most of which have been unpublicized because newspapers shy at getting caught in religious controversies which might backfire. The most sobering case was that of the ten-year-old Audrey Kay Whitney, a diabetic who had been getting along happily on regular insulin injections until a prominent practitioner, into whose

hands she was placed by her aunt, ordered "no medication." When the child promptly developed alarming symptoms, she was still not permitted to return to the successful medical regimen. Before long she died in coma. Practitioner, nurse and guardian were arrested for manslaughter. When they were discharged by a judge on the plea that a guardian has the right to choose for a minor the type of treatment he or she deems best, the heart-broken father was outraged. After brooding for years, he returned to the scene and shot the practitioner—whose "radical reliance on Principle" did not keep him from resorting to the human expedient of running in panic from his assailant until he fell. The temper of public sentiment was reflected in the father's acquittal by a Chicago jury in 1959.

Strangely enough, this and other like incidents have not shaken the complacency of the ivory tower boys who engineer the uncompromising war with *materia medica*, as attested by the oft-and-recently-repeated Boston proclamation that "materia medica has *no* place in the life of the Christian Scientist."

The purported incompatibility of human expedients with prayer for the sick is another phantom problem, an outcome of dualistic thinking. This is readily seen when the matter is thought through independently of decrees, threats, fetishes, tabus, sanctified tenets.

If existence is entirely mental, as every Christian Scientist on earth concedes, then *there could be no essential difference between the rearrangement of large masses (as bones in surgery) and the rearrangement of small masses (as molecules in medical chemistry).*

Lay hold on this simple and indisputable principle and you will never have any borderline cases, where decision is difficult as to just how far to go in the use of material aids. You'll decide not on the basis of blind faith, tradition, unproved theory, wishful thinking or fear of ecclesiastical penalties for nonconformity, but on the basis of practical demonstration.

Demonstration is the line of demarcation, the one thing that decides how far you can or should go. You're still eating and drinking and riding elevators, aren't you? Well, now, if you regard matter as something divorced from Spirit, even in belief, this would mean that you were relying on matter for survival. The fact is that this Life you are living, or functioning as, is mental *in toto.* In the measure that you understand it to be *spiritually* mental, those aspects of living which you call respiration and digestion and transportation will be found uncontaminated and unfettered by material hypotheses.

If you are honest and clear on your acceptance of the proposition that there is one all-constituting

Mind, you will have to admit that every beneficial thing in human experience is no less than the divine good itself, even if dimly seen and incorrectly interpreted.

Mrs. Eddy must have had this in mind when she advocated recourse to anaesthetics for otherwise-unconquered pain (*Science and Health*, p. 464); when she herself employed them, as officially admitted (*Journal*, March 1929); when she told of resorting to dental surgery and anaesthesia around 1900 (*Sentinel*, Vol. 3, p. 217); advised and paid for the surgical excision of her sister-in-law's cancer when it failed to disappear under Christian Science treatment in 1906 (*Bates-Dittemore*, p. 383); and openly wore spectacles in public (*Studdert-Kennedy*, p. 300). Inquiries on these significant facts have always been answered evasively by officialdom, although their authenticity has been certified in writing by the supreme historical authority of The Mother Church, Judge Clifford P. Smith.

If as a result of Christian Science treatment it can be shown that a bone is intact and not out of place, according to human standards as established by those who have made a life study of anatomy, then obviously no surgeon is needed to set it. That's the test: demonstration. If your teeth exhibit a sound condition humanly, you need no dentist to repair them. If you are manifestly free of diabetes,

you will need no insulin. And so it goes.

As self-evident as all this seems to be, teachers present conflicting views throughout the field—at least those who have the courage to discuss this subject at all. A George Shaw Cook pupil reports her teacher as holding that it is better to die standing for Principle than to live in consequence of an operation. Contrariwise, Bicknell Young, when asked on one occasion whether an operation should be permitted, said tersely, "You don't want your patient to die, do you?" The teachers generally approve dental work freely, seeing no inconsistency in disapproving the other branches of medical practice. As you see, the lines are drawn arbitrarily, with thinly concealed allegiance to tradition, not principles.

It makes no difference how you rationalize Mrs. Eddy's own use of morphine to deaden pain from the kidney stones with which she suffered latterly, the inescapable fact is that this recourse to chemical reactions "in belief" differs not at all in principle from any other use of chemical reactions, such as, say, those of insulin. Let us have done with mischievous sophistry, and be fair and scientific at whatever risk of ostracism.

The scandalous failures of the impractical idealists who crow about ordering "no medication" and "off with the splints" have alienated thousands of

good people and straight thinkers who would otherwise have swelled the decelerating ranks of Christian Science churchdom.

What is spiritually true is humanly demonstrable, but it is not humanly true until humanly demonstrated. That is a cardinal and easily grasped principle.

And the essential fact is that good must appear in human experience, if at all, according to human standards of good and in humanly apprehensible ways—in the language, that is, of current understanding. Whether good appears to us for the nonce to be food, clothing, shelter, breathing, motoring or the balm of Gilead and balms of less poetic ring, is of little moment when we know that literally all is mental and, in the final analysis, divinely mental. Meanwhile, let us not cravenly surrender to the dangerous conspiracy of silence simply because we seek personal peace and possibly petty recognition by the handful of regimented people.

All this is pretty strong medicine for some of you probably. But being a metaphysician is serious business, and you must accept its obligations and responsibilities along with its rewards. If you have found the above dispassionate scrutiny of the practice disturbing, it is about time you took a more adult attitude toward the whole thing. Maturity is shown in a willingness to leave the old landmarks,

even joy to see them disappear, a greatly revered pace-setter has remarked, as you know. Paul said: "When I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child: but when I became a man, I put away childish things."

CHURCH

When I resigned from the church in 1945 to publish my book *Christian Science Class Instruction* unhampered by institutional restrictions and inhibitions and controversy, I was urged by The Mother Church officials to reconsider and withdraw my resignation. Since that time my organizationist friends have kept at me in an attempt to convince me that the church, as a human footstep, is indispensable, and that I should work within it to make it the very best church possible.

Now one does not undertake in metaphysics to perpetuate any human footstep; one undertakes to establish Mind as All, the result being that the best human footstep, or concession, is taken—or found entirely unnecessary. That is why we cannot outline these things in advance. Thus it is not the truth about church which should be our primary concern, but the truth about religion, divine communion. It is the religion which must survive and prosper. One would have to assume personal infallibility to say which, if any, human footsteps are

essential to the exercise of religion either presently or in the future.

Another false analogy persistently voiced is that church corresponds to religion in the same way that body corresponds to man, and will be around just as long as body is around. In the first place, body is the only way in which we are able to see man. It is the obviously indispensable evidence, to us at any rate, of his being. Is church the only way in which religion can appear? Must not the time inevitably come, as Mrs. Eddy asserted, when the Church of Christ, which is simply the religious element, shall exist alone in the affections? (Mis. 145:3-5) The founder of the Christian Science Church, be it remembered, picked the church dedication number of the *Journal* (Vol. 9, pp. 487-488) in which to remind her followers that it is *not* indispensable to organize churches as a perpetual ceremonial of Christian Science, that even The Mother Church was no more than a concession to the period. (Misc. 90-91)

Those of you who are still church members, then, should know that it is not Church which you are seeking, but the Christ Mind. In the practice you heal men, not diseases; likewise, it is the religion which is to be demonstrated unafflicted and untrammeled, not the institution, the material container. "The structure of Truth and Love" is nothing more nor less than the universe, so that defining

Church as such, it is merely being said that the great, wide, wonderful, unlimited universe is your place in which to worship God and honor His Christ. The material institution is *designed* to show forth the Christianly scientific spirit—surely not to enclose it, embody it, or pipe it in.

The organization-minded would substitute church for religion. The worship of the material temple is the discouragingly recurrent fact of history. A hard-learned lesson is that church has always stifled every vigorous religious movement upon which it has been superimposed. Greed for power and glory and riches has incessantly prompted the priestly element to latch on to mankind's hopes and fears and wishes and superstitions, in order to enslave and strip the masses. Those who are not alert to the encroachments on religion of churchism fall its ready prey.

If we persist in mistaking Church for Religion, confusing the material and the spiritual, we are headed for sore disillusionment. The churchist, ultimately discovering what outsiders already know, namely, that the organization is dwindling, is dismayed. The six-year Christian Science Committee on Publication for Northern California, official custodian of the membership rolls, discloses that the church is not only failing to keep abreast of the exploding population, but, right here in this most

lush of its communities, is actually dropping steadily in total number of members. The *Journal* registry has lost hundreds of names.

How are we to look at this undeniable decline? Those who honor that "free thought which accompanies approaching Science and cannot be put down" lift up their eyes, seeing the fields white already for the harvest, in the astonishing proliferation of Christian Scientists outside the regimented ranks of churchdom. How else could we expect our Truth to redeem all mankind?

There is one word of caution for those of you who find the containment and control intrinsic to churchism intolerable, and, in simple fairness and consistency, decide to shed the ecclesiastical shackles. Do not act impulsively, but be sure your decision is a mature one. Then act and stand decisively. The standard practice of officialdom is to ask resignees to reconsider, thus leaving themselves under Boston jurisdiction—and on the well-known blacklist as unstable, if not downright disloyal. The gullible lady from Denver, like many others who have failed to heed this warning, allowed herself to be enticed back into the fold only to be expelled in semi-public disgrace soon afterward (on the trumped-up charge that she trafficked in "unauthorized literature").

It has never been my policy to entice students out of or into church, for *which* material props the

individual feels needful are a matter of individual demonstration. Pushed out of church prematurely, people sometimes flounder. Still, patently fallacious would be the condescending attitude that *others* need a church, or that the institution is the repository of all Truth, or that it is God's law that spiritual understanding can be disseminated only through an organization, or that the finite device of church is essential to salvation. Metaphysically understood, you are never in the Church anyway; whatever may be true and legitimate about Church is in you—included in, or as, the indivisible consciousness.

Herbert Eustace contended that without The Mother Church we wouldn't have the literature, without which it is inconceivable that the movement could exist in earthly affairs. It is true that Mrs. Eddy could not get her book into even nominal circulation until she got a church organization going, its every member a zealous salesman. That was *her* demonstration for *that* day. Ultimately it is not salesmanship, but demonstration which is required. Proof of this is that my book, *Christian Science Class Instruction,* sold more copies in its first decade, without the support or facilities of a church organization, than the number of copies of *Science and Health* sold for the corresponding period, I believe, in the light of Orcutt's officially approved report in *Mary Baker Eddy and Her Books.*

Scientific thought spreads itself — this without necessary recourse to organized promotion. All Einstein had to do was to turn his relativity idea loose to have it find its way into the homes and shops, the libraries, schools, laboratories, the conversations and the practices of men and women everywhere. The science of numbers has spread itself inexorably throughout all the lands without concerted effort on the part of some band or bands of people working to that end. Of course the scientific approach to God cannot do this without being divorced from the stultifying confines of denominationalism. Liberation of thought is impossible while tied to some brand or trademark. After all, though, what's in a name but the narrowing of thought and purpose?

Scientific thought spreads itself, permeating everywhere in spite of organized groups, hostile or friendly. This is borne out tellingly today by the Christian Science Church periodicals, in which ideas and expressions from my anathematized writings have continued to crop up increasingly during the past sixteen years. When a Los Angeles practitioner, Renee Dellavoix, congratulated editor Richard J. Davis on what she took to be courageous progressiveness in using material from an anathematized source, Mr. Davis's answering letter did not deny the appearance in his editorials of material identical

with that first-published in *Christian Science Class Instruction*, but took refuge in the statement that he understood Mr. Corey's book included material from franchised church teachers!

We need not condone what we believe to be deliberate plagiarism, any more than did Mrs. Eddy, in order to be honestly grateful that redemptive truths are getting out to hungry mankind through hostile as well as friendly media.

Three copies of my anathematized treatise are maintained in the church publication committee office at San Francisco, with presumably the same holding true for all other state offices throughout the world. Is it, then, surprising that recognizable material from *Christian Science Class Instruction* creeps into the church periodicals from time to time nowadays?

Incidentally, I still receive many inquiries regarding the prominent *Journal*-listed teacher who, though he had never met me nor read my writings, libeled me in a violently condemnatory letter to a magazine editor when my book first came out (as recounted in *Personal Introduction to God*, p. 179, and in Braden's *Christian Science Today*, p. 194). Like many another Mother Churchman coming to scoff, he remained to pray. Under date of October 9, 1962, this same teacher now writes me: "We are one in our sense of truth, and I would appreciate it very

much were you to give me permission to quote you on a few occasions, giving you credit of course. Your statement is clear, direct, and to the point." You, my pupils, are entitled to share with me this vindication of our school of thought and of our unimpeachable motivation in releasing class teaching from the cloistered confines of institutionalism.

The most impressive proof that scientific thought will penetrate all barriers is the article *There Is No Death*, now being pushed in all Christian Science reading rooms in the popular leaflet form as a reprint from the September 1950 *Journal*. (The local librarian tells me that a surprising number of Scientists buy it to send out in place of letters of condolence to the bereaved.) Signed by a Florida practitioner, the article unmistakably borrows in substantial part from my *Christian Science Class Instruction*, published five years previously.

[In connection with this last example, the background of my little dissertation on death may be of some interest. In 1889 Bishop Wilberforce suggested to Hugh A. Studdert-Kennedy that "passing on" was something like sailing off across the horizon. Mr. Studdert-Kennedy in his exquisite prose presented this idea charmingly, if briefly, in his book *Arise, Shine*. Its penetrating insight led me to develop the idea, elaborating it into a full chapter. The *Journal* writer surely identified his source when he used

unique idea sequences and even some of the characteristic phraseology of my prior exposition of the thesis.]

As a sectarian faith, Christian Science might require a material church organization to extend its life and influence. But as a science, its spread is contingent upon its compelling logic and practical demonstrability. Often I have been asked if I think an unorganized movement can compete with sects which draw strength from the powerful faith in each that it is the exclusive instrument of the Lord. I answer with the question: Has mathematics, or any other *science*, been the offspring of institutionalism?

Science and authoritarianism are irreconcilable. The essentially free thought requisite to science is inherently antagonistic to the solidifying tendency of organization, as always manifest in dogma, containment, orthodoxy. And what could be more insidiously degrading than to give lip service to individual freedom of intellect and conscience whilst practicing or submitting to regimentation?

Dictatorship is dictatorship whether ecclesiastical or secular, but there are many who want subjugation and believe it is needed. Imagine what regimentation inevitably does to scientific progress! On the secular side, Galileo was stopped in his tracks; on the theological side, you know what happened to Jesus when his views and acts conflicted with the

established order. Officialdom, the self-appointed guardian of truth and virtue, fought as it always must to discredit the disquieting innovator.

My dear friend Thomas Dreier writes: "You are in a pretty hopeless state if you cannot live a religious or a good life without ecclesiastics or an organization. Perhaps you need to learn what the little boy learned. 'Mommie,' said the lad, 'last night when you were away at bedtime, I looked for someone to say my prayers to. Nurse had gone and auntie was talking on the phone.' 'What did you do then?' asked the mother. 'Why,' answered the smart child, 'I said my prayers straight to God.' "

Fortunately, scientific thought recommends itself not through the prestige of its proponents but through scientific understanding. In holding that science requires no earthly guardians, it cannot be ignored that a sizeable contingent in the Church leans to the ancient concept of "a revealed religion" belonging personally to its revelator and in turn to his or her successors in office. To escape the requirements of science, with which this concept is incompatible, many rhetorical devices have been hit upon by the revelationists. One of these is to declare that Christian Science is Science but not a science. Typically, a contemporary British Christian Scientist contends in an article that Mrs. Eddy did not employ the word *science* in its normal, accepted

meaning, but in accordance with her own exclusive definition, since her metaphysical system was one of subjective relationships and values entirely inaccessible to logical analysis.

If this be so, why then call it something it is not? In addressing a redemptive message to the world we cannot ignore the definition of *science* already established universally through usage. If we regard the Eddy doctrine a mystical revelation, instead of as a science, then let us call it by its right name. If it is regarded as an essentially new concept, corresponding with nothing familiar, then it should have a unique name of its own. Where accuracy has been required, it has always been standard practice to coin new words for new concepts, deriving them from proper philological roots (customarily the Latin or the Greek). The "revealed religion" contingent only confounds confusion by arbitrarily giving *science* a definition alien to its recognized meaning. Such linguistic promiscuity would make a farce of Christian Science as Science. Haven't some of us forgotten that words are signals mutually agreed upon for communication?

It was Humpty Dumpty who said, "When I use a word it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

UNIVERSAL FRANCHISE

In passing, let me point out again that there is no such thing as requiring a license to practice Christian Science. An attempt to regiment healing by prayer through legislation would be unconstitutional, to say the least, and would make the Church an extralegal arm of the government, a license bureau violating the separation-of-church-and-state principle, as well as setting up an ecclesiastical monopoly. Not official sanction, but the ability to heal the sick through Science, establishes "your position as a Christian Scientist." (See *Science and Health*, p. 182). Just as in the other branches of the great spiritual healing movement, by their works ye shall know them. In other words, it is not a matter of institutional or governmental regulation, but a matter of individual demonstration.

Vested ecclesiastical interests, failing to control all practitioners, have resorted to intimidation, circulating the word through its agents that without the prestige of church sanction independent practitioners and teachers cannot command the necessary respect for even a modicum of success. Well, now, let's get this thing out into the light and look at it.

If you want first-hand information from successful independents, talk with your classmates Renee Dellavoix, Marita Latham, Rachel Nicolson, to

mention those few who catch my eye at the moment. Or call on Herbert and Genevieve George, Journal-listed veterans who played leading roles for The Mother Church in France, casting off the institutional shackles following my 1946 class.

Or take my case. Following six years in the *Christian Science Journal* registry, I withdrew my name therefrom and resigned from the organization, only to continue as a public practitioner of Christian Science, so listed in the telephone directories for a dozen years thereafter. As indicated in Marquis: *Who's Who in the West*, I withdrew from the general practice in 1957 because of an overcrowded schedule. Meanwhile my classes have been filled to capacity, as you can see from this large gathering here, which is typical, and none have been too humble or too mighty—or too prone to sell their birthright for a mess of institutional pottage—to attend. This includes a number of Journal-listed people, teachers, housewives, business executives, artisans, et alia. Our class here in San Francisco today, for example, includes the vice-president of Eastern Air Lines (who is incidentally a director on a branch church board), two ordained ministers, a successful practicing doctor of medicine, painter Patricia Christian, concert pianist Harold Griffin, television producer Alfred Chance (attached to the Red Skelton and George Gobel shows), and

our beloved Ruth St. Denis, one of the greatest creative artists of all time, to mention but the most prominent who can be safely mentioned. On the urging of Adela Rogers St. Johns, I taught the Bel Air class, which was aimed at opening the way for motion picture exposition of our teaching and including as pupils such influential dignitaries as Jesse L. Lasky, acknowledged founder of the great Hollywood film industry (who was at the time producing the *Caruso* picture, starring Mario Lanza). Other pupils were Robert Alton (the Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer movie director), Marion Morgan (whose "Morgan Dancers" made terpsichorean history), Dr. Gertrude Laws (the educator), certain members of the *Christian Science Monitor* staff, Principia College instructors, Henry Newmark (secretary to Frederick Dixon, foremost Christian Scientist editor), Basil Woon (Hearst editor and feature writer), Ivy Crane Wilson (Hollywood representative of the London Star), Vera Pulis (syndicated columnist), London-Berlin-New York concert singer Dorothea Johnston, also Mark Twain's daughter Clara Clemens (Mrs. Jacques Sammosoud, author of *Awake to a Perfect Day*), and other exemplary personages too numerous to mention here. Glancing down from this platform at the moment, I spy a distinguished university professor, a well-known attorney, some Journal-listed practitioners (who shall

remain safely anonymous!), several New Thought leaders including the Rev. Mme. Desiree de Savignac and Thane Walker. There behind Ruth St. Denis sits Lillian Fontaine (mother of Olivia de Haviland and Joan Fontaine, and star material in her own right), not to mention my blessed Clarissa (herself a distinguished metaphysician, who used to write for the periodicals when she was consultant to Judge Clifford P. Smith). Only those who don't mind are mentioned, but this should be enough to prick the bubble of evil report.

Independent writings, too, are discouraged in much the same way. Most revealing were the responses I got when I tried to persuade other and perhaps more worthy writers to take the risk of doing a class-type treatise before thinking of attempting it myself. When my wife and I urged Peter Ross to let us publish his class, he said: "I'm an old man and I'm tired of fighting." When I suggested to Edna Kimball Wait that she should get out the Kimball class teaching she exclaimed: "Why Boston would crucify me!" When I proposed a classbook to my dear old friend, Gilbert Carpenter, Jr., he told me of the persecution he had suffered for printing up for private use some far less provocative materials. For years I tried to induce Gustavus Swift Paine to let Farallon publish his formulation of the teaching. He wrote this demurrer: "A book

should have a good structure, and a passably consecutive system would arouse attacks by philosophers, psychologists, and those of other disciplines. The whole should be made as nearly fool-proof as possible, [but] it would stir up a commotion. [The church] still seems to be in the doldrums, with a good deal of latent rancor. In due course the virulence will subside. I have a reputation for patience."

Thus it fell to my lot to test demonstration!

SUMMARY

With the infinite variety and intelligible coordination of the teeming universe about us, it would seem quite irrational to regard creation as random, accidental, purposeless. The human interpretation or sense of our universe may be frought with inharmonies mundane, but, despite this, the majestic design unfolding by way of our world, no matter how dimly perceived, testifies to that guiding intelligence we designate *God*, does it not? To believe there is no more to life than appears superficially in that all-too-short journey from cradle to grave, would be to fly in the face of reason and evidence.

Mind, accepted as ultimate Cause, would have us moving in a mental creation, material though it might appear from the human point of view: a world of thought where recognition of the law of

God as the only law becomes thereby the law to all things of our experience. In the vagaries of work-aday preoccupations, it is easy to lose sight of this, to be sure. At such moments of faltering, something in the way of deliberate effort to regain altitude, to restore perspective, must be resorted to. In the practice this usually takes the form of analysis, review, summary, argument, aimed at establishing the viewpoint of Mind divine. Veteran metaphysicians oftentimes write me that they are aided in this endeavor by a thoughtful review of the "God chapters" of *Christian Science Class Instruction* (pp. 1-48).

If, even with such a reversion to the ABCs of Science, divine realization remains elusive, it has been found helpful on occasion to ponder the next four chapters of our treatise (pp. 49-96), bearing upon Mind's self-conceived image of itself, man or manifestation. Tying man in thus with the Godhead is, of course, an essential of applied metaphysics, bringing the divine idea down to earth, so to speak, where all the power and glory of the Almighty can be experienced healingly.

Truly to rest in this comforting knowledge of God-with-us we must, perforce, perceive divinity manifest in and as our immediate world, with harmony, completeness, perfection evidenced concretely on all sides. So, when we are confronted with a distressing

sense of reality which is clearly at variance with our proclaimed divinity, we are obliged to take up and handle the picture to the end of correcting it. If for the individual this momentarily involves such human procedures as affirmation-and-denial, so be it.

Somewhere along in the treatment we must, of course, find ourselves alone with God, where conflict and contest are unknown, impossible. Whether this exalted state or stage becomes our habitual everyday experience remains an individual matter, certainly. And, if we are to credit history, no one has yet been able to sustain the God vision indefinitely, uninterruptedly, at the human level. We are told in Scripture that there were times when Jesus faltered. And, despite the official myth, Mrs. Eddy was, like Jesus, tempted in all things like as we are.

So, day by day we have to go along with what we have and are, where we reside mentally for the nonce, our ever-ascending level of understanding determining the degree of absoluteness in our practice.

What you call the material universe is the divine creation, dimly seen and incorrectly interpreted, but still the divine creation itself. With this insight, which constitutes a real metaphysical breakthrough, we have reached the point of no return.

But establishing practically the allness of divine Mind requires much more than a theoretical premise. That which is divinely true is humanly demonstrable,

but it is not humanly true until it is humanly demonstrated or proven. Advancing understanding sponstaneously corrects our misinterpretation, or false sense of things, and this is the transformation called "healing." We perforce interpret things automatically, involuntarily, in terms of current understanding, in the language of contemporary thought, so that the demonstration of good comes as what is nearest right under the circumstances.

It has been my observation that metaphysicians who complain about failure to demonstrate, or of how metaphysics has failed them, or of their supposedly innate inability to make the grade in metaphysics, are usually guilty of failing to persevere. One thing every practitioner must learn:

Take your stand, hold it, and follow through. This is rudimentary. Yet it is evident that seekers as a rule just do not stick it out. I cannot recall an instance where Science has failed when its advocates took a firm stand, held unwaveringly to it, and then followed all the way through to the inevitably divine conclusion.

Of course, you have to start out from right where you are, or seem to be (if you will), raising no phantom obstacles—not the least of which would be the sterile question of how or why existence may appear to be material, human, moribund, other than divine. Instead, take your stand for the absolute (as

you see it), then do the best you can reasonably and practically with what develops in the way of "human circumstances." You will then find, I am firmly convinced, that the outward situation develops miraculously so that harmony becomes the order of the day.

But you cannot expect to be able to bring this about any old time when you have, in effect, put God at the bottom of the heap, seeking Him out only in time of trouble. You'd better begin by putting God at the top of the heap, and then go on keeping Him there. Divine worship does not mean the idolizing of people, however exalted; it means divine communion. To the extent that this is achieved, it is the divine Presence understood, realized, experienced.

The habit of speculating on ultimates is of no help. The oft-raised question as to whether you will have a spiritual body after you have transcended the material body, is a sample. The thing that concerns you is immediate reality as you are seeing it. Here you are with or as body, without which you would be dead and gone, to all intents and purposes. It's never a question of some theoretical future state, in which man may or may not be bodiless; the question is, how are you going to understand, and what are you going to do with, your own inescapable embodiment as of now? You'll

have plenty to occupy you right here, without having to reach out through speculation and theory toward an indeterminate ultimate. So far, the only evidence we have that man *is*, appears as body.

"Supply" has been a stickler for Scientists generally, even for Scientists who enjoy remarkable success at healing the sick. The sense of insufficient substance ought to be less obtrusive for the monist finding that, with mind being all there is to all including money, money is omnipresent. See:

Christian Science Class Instruction
90:3-15, 95:14 to 96:6, 245:18 to 248:4
Personal Introduction to God
182:1 to 183:31

"Marriage" has been a baffler for conscientious students from the earliest days of the movement. It should be no problem from the standpoint of monism, where marriage would have to be recognized as simply a way—not necessarily the only way —of seeing the divine completeness.

Christian Science Class Instruction
231:1 to 234:30, 295:22-39, 248:30 to 249:10,
80:23 to 81:11, 179:15-26, 227:2-22

"The Movement," which can be defined metaphysically only as the spiritual understanding of its participants in action has, through language abuses and careless thinking, been confused with material organization. Without a correct perspective, based

upon an over-all survey of the movement, it would be quite impossible to evaluate its human appearing in its various essential aspects. No knowledgeable student of metaphysics, whatever his brand, would be without the following source books for occasional study and frequent reference:

Christian Science Today, by Charles S. Braden
Christian Science and Organized Religion
by Hugh A. Studdert-Kennedy

When we speak of the Christian movement which blankets the Western World, we are certainly not equating *movement* with *organization*. The great Christian movement encompasses all who are of the Christian persuasion, whether they be identified with the Roman Catholic, Protestant or Christian Scientist churches, or with no church at all, obviously. Only die-hard ecclesiastics could think of making the outrageous claim that *their* institution "is the watchful and tender guardian of human consciousness in its ascent Godward." (*Sentinel*, Vol. XLIX, p. 1114)

As The Mother Church board wrote all its *Journal*-listees in 1938, not all Christian Scientists are church members. The number outside the church possibly exceeds greatly the number inside its confines. You don't suppose infinite Mind is occupied with such finite matters as your fraternal or institutional status, do you? As Mrs. Eddy says in *Science and Health* (p. 182), your healing work determines your position

as a Christian Scientist—hardly your organizational status.

What about the critical international situation, with its threat of world destruction through nuclear holocaust? With wars and rumors of wars, and men's hearts failing them for fear, what are we to think and do?

Well, in our secret mental closet at least, we must insist every single step of the way: "There is nothing going on but God!" That is our premise. We must revert to it whenever we lose our bearings in a teeming sea of threat and problem. Surely it is never too late to demonstrate the allness of good?

The stultifying patterns of popular theology have failed to bring us peace and fellowship, betraying themselves to be as deadly in their emasculating sectarianism as the selfish provincialism of the jingoists. A few years back the nations were insulated from each other to some extent through difficult communications and snaillike travel; today rapid transit and instant communication squeeze mankind into an unwelcome intimacy, an intimacy demanding mutual adjustment for which people are patently ill-prepared. At this critical juncture all the resources of human-level thinking have proven themselves woefully insufficient. Are we not, then, forced at last to turn wholeheartedly to something beyond, above, superior to the merely human? Those who

do not glimpse this much are even now exhibiting an alarming cynicism, a crushing, deadening sense of resignation.

A prayerful study of our chapter *World Salvation* would assuredly be in order for us. It obviously contains much not yet digested. Why should it be thought a thing incredible that God does hold the winds in His fist? And that turning to Him rationally (scientifically) should bring on the millenium? With rare insight, Mary Baker Eddy has said that one Mind unifies men and nations, constitutes the brotherhood of man, ends wars, leaving nothing that can sin, suffer, be punished or destroyed. Is not this pure, redemptive Monism?

We need not shrink from the task that is set before us, even though it may momentarily appear to be ours alone for the understanding we possess. The time-worn notion that we must save the world piecemeal, waiting for every single individual to be converted to our way of looking at things, would give us little hope of outrunning the ever-accelerating dash toward disaster. Theological revivalism can hardly be the Way. Is not metaphysics our last, best hope?

As an insignificant mortal trembling in a vast cosmos you may feel pretty small, impotent. The atom is small, but it is stupendously powerful. All that is true of the atom is true of you. As Mind in

expression, you embody all the might of God, divine, irresistible Principle!

How can we establish the transfiguring Truth, if such it be? Why, through thinking. Thinking is the open door to living realization. There is no esoteric mumbojumbo about this ascension. It is just a common-sense, straight-forward turning to Reality as divinely mental in the ultimate. The enforcement of divine law through Mind's realization, elementary in its simplicity, primeval in its uncomplicated naturalness, should require nothing in the way of unique, or even rare, personal gifts. The ability to find God at hand must belong to everyone on earth as a common heritage—if there is any hope or promise for humanity.

To mount the Great White Throne, to look out from Mind instead of up to Mind, would surely be to have the afflictive aspects of your present sense of being fall away like the hateful rags of poverty with the advent of treasure, to cast off the bonds of tyranny for the dignity of spiritual integrity and sanctity of conscience, to find the barriers to satisfying fellowship dissolving, to apprehend bodily wholeness and harmony, to find dominion over the whole earth your very own this instant. Must not the inexorable trend of scientific thought vanquish ignorance, superstitution, blighting creed and dogma and ritual?

Congratulations! Welcome to the ranks of the Emancipated! You would not have read thus far had you not already cast off the shackles—at least in spirit. The infinity of uncloistered Mind is opening up before you, bringing the spreading perspective that means the new heaven and the new earth promised aforetime. Is not now your Prayer something like this . . .

Mind
Thou art the power and the glory
And the majesty forever
Thy kingdom is come
Thy will done
In this that is Realization

Prime Study Works

•

by Arthur Corey

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE CLASS INSTRUCTION
A rounded treatise on premise and application
($6.75 postpaid)

PERSONAL INTRODUCTION TO GOD
A popular treatment of the subject
($4.00 postpaid)

by Hugh A. Studdert-Kennedy

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND ORGANIZED RELIGION
The classic work on Church
($4.50 postpaid)

by Charles S. Braden

CHRISTIAN SCIENCE TODAY
The definitive study of the Movement
($5.95 postpaid)

•

The Farallon Foundation

(*A non-profit public service*)
Box 799
Los Gatos, California, U.S.A.



University of
Connecticut
Libraries

39153026615734